United Nations DP/FPA/2015/12

Executive Board of the United Nations Development Programme, the United Nations Population Fund and the United Nations Office for Project Services

Distr.: General
30 June 2015

Original: English

Second regular session 2015
31 August to 4 September 2015, New York
Item 10 of the provisional agenda
UNFPA – evaluation

United Nations Population Fund

Quadrennial budgeted evaluation plan, 2016-2019

Summary

The quadrennial budgeted evaluation for 2016-2019 has been prepared in line with the revised evaluation policy of UNFPA (DP/FPA/2013/5), in accordance with relevant Executive Board decisions, and with General Assembly resolution 67/226 on the quadrennial comprehensive policy review of operational activities for development of the United Nations system.

The plan presents the strategic approach to planning and coverage and details proposed corporate and programme-level evaluations for UNFPA, together with information on resources, expected budget, key risks and reporting arrangements.

Elements of a decision

The Executive Board may wish to:

(a) *Welcome* the proposal to move from a biennial to a quadrennial budgeted evaluation for 2016-2019;

(b) *Acknowledge* the transparent and participatory process undertaken by UNFPA in developing the quadrennial budgeted evaluation for 2016-2019;

(c) *Approve* the quadrennial budgeted evaluation for 2016-2019.

15-11064 (E) 080715

Please recycle

Contents

I. Background and purpose of the quadrennial budgeted evaluation plan 3
II. Strategic approach to planning and coverage 3
A. Principles 3
B. Selection criteria 3
C. Process 4
D. Evolving needs – new approaches 4
E. Coverage 5
III. Proposed corporate evaluations 6
IV. Programme-level evaluations 8
V. Resources for evaluation 9
A. Human resources 9
B. Financial resources 10
VI. Expected budget 11
VII. Risks 14
VIII. Reporting 14

Annexes

1. Proposed Corporate Evaluations
2. Proposed Programme – Level Evaluations
3. Corporate Evaluations – Selectivity Analysis

Annexes are available on the UNFPA website.

I. Background and purpose of the quadrennial budgeted evaluation plan

1. In line with the revised UNFPA evaluation policy (DP/FPA/2013/5), evaluation at UNFPA serves three main purposes:

(a) It is a means to demonstrate accountability to stakeholders on performance achieved;

(b) It supports evidence-based decision-making;

(c) It contributes important lessons learned to the knowledge base of the organization.

2. As defined in the revised UNFPA evaluation policy, evaluations fall into two categories:

(a) *Corporate evaluations* are independent exercises undertaken by the Evaluation Office in order to assess issues that contribute to achieving the goals of the UNFPA strategic plan with regard to development effectiveness and organizational performance;

(b) *Programme-level evaluations* are managed by the business units in charge of the concerned programmes; independent external evaluators pre-qualified by the Evaluation Office conduct programme-level evaluations according to terms of reference approved by the Evaluation Office.

3. The budgeted evaluation plan is in accordance with the revised evaluation policy approved by the Executive Board in decision 2013/21, and is aligned with paragraphs 174 and 175 of General Assembly resolution 67/226 on the quadrennial comprehensive policy review of operational activities for development of the United Nations system.

4. The purpose of the budgeted evaluation plan, 2016-2019, is to provide a coherent framework to guide the commissioning, management and use of evaluations at all levels of UNFPA; and to provide a basis for monitoring and reporting on UNFPA evaluation results.

5. The plan should be viewed as flexible and responsive to the changing context and emerging priorities. In order for the plan to support a balanced approach between strategic coverage and utility of evaluation, it is proposed that the plan cover four years, divided into two two-year periods. Firm proposals are presented for 2016-2017, and indicative proposals for 2018-2019. The plan will be reviewed and updated in 2017 to ensure it is fully aligned with the next UNFPA strategic plan and budget cycle.

II. Strategic approach to planning and coverage

A. Principles

6. The following principles have guided the elaboration of the quadrennial budgeted evaluation plan:

(c) It is based on the criteria put forward in paragraph 14 of the revised evaluation policy;

(d) It provides an adequate level of coverage and necessary alignment with the UNFPA strategic plan and business model;

(e) It provides reasonable and geographically balanced coverage;

(f) It ensures a balance between accountability and learning, with a clear focus on utility (a varied range of evaluation products to feed into key decision points);

(g) Human and financial resources invested in evaluation are commensurate with an appropriate level of coverage and with the necessary alignment with UNFPA strategic plan and business model;

(h) It was developed in a consultative process.

B. Selection criteria

7. All selection criteria, in the order of priority set in the policy, were used to guide the selection of corporate and programme-level evaluations.

C. Process

8. The quadrennial budgeted evaluation plan was developed in close consultation with relevant organizational business units. For corporate evaluations, an organization-wide consultation was conducted, followed by detailed consultations at headquarters level, and with other United Nations organizations (to identify potential joint evaluations). The selection of proposed programme-level evaluations is the result of consultations with the six regional offices. The plan was tabled for input from the Executive Committee and benefited from the engagement of the Executive Board at informal briefings in January and May 2015.

D. Evolving needs – new approaches

9. The development landscape in which UNFPA operates is changing fast. In particular, the sustainable development goals, new types of development partnerships and, within the United Nations, the 'fit for purpose' agenda will demand changes in the way UNFPA operates. Well designed, timely evaluations will be important to inform evidence-based decision-making and contribute to lesson learning in UNFPA. At the same time, the maturation of the UNFPA evaluation function and gradual strengthening of systems and capacities permit UNFPA to diversify the range of evaluations conducted at all levels, to better respond to lesson learning and accountability needs.

10. Since 2010, UNFPA has conducted 91 country programme evaluations, managed by country offices. By the beginning of 2016, six country programme evaluations will have been conducted by the Evaluation Office to develop evaluation methods, tools and guidance to support the optimal quality and utility of country programme evaluations conducted by UNFPA country offices. Looking ahead, the Evaluation Office aims to achieve broader engagement at country level; however, this is not possible under the current modalities and available resources. From 2016, the Evaluation Office will no longer conduct country programme evaluations; instead it will develop and pilot a new cluster approach to country programme evaluation. This will consist of evaluating clusters of up to five country programmes, selected on the basis of comparable contexts or development challenges relevant to UNFPA. Cluster evaluations would build on the planned timetable of country programme evaluations, enabling a more effective pooling of Evaluation Office and country office resources to facilitate lesson learning. The methodology would be based on a dual approach: assessment of country programme performance and cross-country learning on specific issues. Evaluation products would include stand-alone country programme evaluation reports and a synthesis report.

11. Increasingly, the United Nations system agencies are seeking to jointly evaluate their combined efforts, in particular in the context of joint programmes or where there are joint system-wide goals. The Evaluation Office will increase efforts to strategically engage in joint or system-wide evaluation initiatives. This may entail managing or conducting joint evaluations or participating in system-wide evaluation initiatives, engaging in reference groups or other joint engagements. A number of corporate evaluations have been identified as potential joint evaluations, subject to final agreement with the United Nations and other partners.

12 The proliferation of increasingly severe and complex humanitarian crises has required more and more UNFPA country offices to engage in humanitarian responses. UNFPA evaluation approaches need to address the specific requirements of assessing performance and lesson learning of humanitarian interventions. Coverage of UNFPA support in humanitarian settings will be reflected in the choice of thematic evaluations that will be conducted in this period. The Evaluation Office also aims to play a more active role in the management of evaluations of level three (L3) emergency responses, as member of the Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluation Steering Group.

13. It is vitally important for UNFPA to fully understand and utilize learning from both corporate and programme evaluations, particularly in relation to systemic and cross-cutting

issues. The Evaluation Office will conduct a mix of synthesis and meta-evaluation studies to allow for cross-cutting learning from corporate and programme evaluations.

14. In the past 10 years, there has been a significant increase in the use of impact-evaluation approaches by many development organizations and Member States. To date, UNFPA has limited experience in commissioning impact evaluations, although it actively draws on evidence produced by impact evaluations in the development of policies and programmes. UNFPA considers that the commissioning of impact evaluations would be of value to generate evidence in areas where there are key evidence gaps, in particular to inform decisions related to scale-up and replication of interventions. In light of the specialist skills and high costs to generate and analyse the complex data and information required for successful impact evaluation, UNFPA aims to focus on interventions relating to adolescent and youth under outcome two of the UNFPA strategic plan. UNFPA will work to identify partnerships and financial resources to support the commissioning and use of impact evaluations in this area.

15. It is anticipated that the range of programme evaluations will change over the next four years to reflect evolving evaluation needs, particularly at country and regional levels:

(a) In view of the revised evaluation policy, it is anticipated that the geographical coverage of UNFPA country programme evaluations will be reduced as countries conduct country programme evaluations every two cycles;

(b) At the same time, evaluations of United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks and Delivering as One, commissioned and managed by United Nations country teams, will become increasingly important.

(c) In recent years, there has been significant growth in earmarked funding, joint programming and joint programmes across UNFPA, particularly at decentralized levels. UNFPA is required to respond to a growing demand from donors and partners for evaluation of these programmes to meet accountability and learning needs.

(d) Regional programmes are an important level for delivery, and there is a need for a more diverse range of evaluations commissioned and managed by regional offices to meet accountability and lesson-learning needs.

16. In principle, these changes should lead to a diversified range of evaluations conducted at country and regional levels and by other business units, which, in turn, should increase the supply of evaluative evidence to better inform decision-making, strengthen accountability and transparency, and contribute to organizational accountability and learning. Some country offices are already planning and budgeting for diverse types of evaluations, as reflected in recent costed evaluation plans presented to the Executive Board. However, this evolution needs to be managed within the limits of UNFPA capacity to commission and manage evaluations to meet the United Nations Evaluation Group norms and standards, and subject to UNFPA quality standards.

17. At present, there is a lack of clarity regarding levels of coverage, funding and quality assurance of decentralized programme-level evaluations other than country programme evaluations. During the upcoming year, the Evaluation Office will develop comprehensive guidance to inform planning, management, resourcing and use of programme level evaluations.

E. Coverage

18. The quadrennial budgeted evaluation plan for 2016-2019 is aligned with outcomes and outputs set out in the UNFPA strategic plan, 2014-2017.

19. Corporate evaluations aim at addressing organizational-wide issues; in particular, they cover the outcomes and outputs of the UNFPA strategic plan and are aligned with the UNFPA business model. Corporate evaluations include thematic, institutional, joint, meta-evaluations and synthesis studies. They also include evaluations of major UNFPA-wide programmes, global trust funds and partnerships at the request of funding partners.

20. In the case of programme-level evaluations, emphasis is placed on country, joint and regional programmes (geographical and thematic coverage). Country programme evaluations are most common, with more limited coverage of regional programme, thematic and joint evaluations.

21. As per the revised evaluation policy, paragraph 13(a), country programme evaluations will be conducted at least once every two programme cycles. Reasonable evaluation coverage for the period 2016-2019 is therefore 50 per cent of those country programmes for which the end-of-programme cycle falls in the period 2017-2020.

22. With respect to evaluation of decentralized non-core funded programmes, an analysis by the Evaluation Office indicates that evaluation should be prioritized for multi-year programmes with a value greater than $5 million, subject to application of UNFPA evaluation criteria.

23. Where an evaluation of a United Nations Development Assistance Framework or Delivering as One is planned, these evaluations are reflected in costed evaluation plans that are presented to the Executive Board together with new country programme documents.

24. Evaluations at project level undertaken by the relevant project managers are not addressed in the revised policy; hence, they are excluded from the present plan.

III. Proposed corporate evaluations

25. The Evaluation Office followed three key steps to identify strategic evaluation priorities in relation to the strategic plan, 2014-2017, and to identify knowledge gaps where corporate evaluations would add value.

26. First, an analysis was conducted to assess the coverage of corporate evaluations in the past five years against the outcomes and outputs of the strategic plan. The analysis found that there had been broad coverage across all four strategic plan outcome areas, but limited focus at output level, with the exception of outcome one. There was strong coverage of outcome one, with a mix of thematic and programme evaluations. However, there were fewer corporate evaluations of the other three outcomes and no coverage of organizational efficiency and effectiveness. Priorities were also informed by analysis of the findings of recent audit reports, the reviews conducted by the Multilateral Organisation Performance Assessment Network (MOPAN)[1] and the Joint Inspection Unit (JIU),[2] and the preliminary findings of the country programme evaluation synthesis study.

27. Second, a long list of the potential corporate evaluations was compiled as the basis for organization-wide consultation, including a survey of country representatives and other senior staff in regional offices and headquarters. This generated a shortlist as the basis for detailed discussions to solicit engagement on evaluation priorities and seek advice on scoping and timing. Consultation was also undertaken with other United Nations organizations, with a view to identifying possible joint evaluations.

28. Third, all proposed corporate evaluations were subject to selectivity analysis to assess the relevance and utility of the proposed evaluation (based on the criteria set out in the revised evaluation policy paragraph 14). Annex 3 provides further information.

29. Table 1 below presents in summary form the broad topics proposed for evaluation by outcome area of the strategic plan, 2014-2017, and the sequencing of evaluations over the four years covered by the plan. The evaluations are expected to be commissioned in the designated year and, in most cases, completed the following year.

[1] MOPAN, United Nations Population Fund, Synthesis Report, 2014 (JIU/REP/2014/6)

[2] The JIU report is particularly useful, as it compares UNFPA to the evaluation function of 24 other organizations of the United Nations system.

Table 1. Proposed corporate evaluations and other evaluation products by outcome, 2016-2019

Plan outcomes	*2016*	*2017*	*2018*	*2019*
Outcome 1	Programme evaluation - end line evaluation of the H4+ joint programmes - Canada and Sweden (SIDA) Programme evaluation - midterm evaluation of GPRHCS II (*) Evaluability study - sexual and reproductive health services in humanitarian settings		Thematic evaluation - sexual and reproductive health services in humanitarian settings	Programme evaluation - final evaluation of GPRHCS II (*)
Outcome 2	Evaluability study - child marriage programmes	Thematic evaluation - comprehensive sexuality education programmes	Programme evaluation - child marriage programmes	
Outcome 3	Thematic evaluation - gender-based violence including in humanitarian settings	Programme evaluation - joint programme evaluation of female genital mutilation joint programme second phase	Thematic evaluation - gender equality, women's and girls' empowerment, and reproductive rights	
Outcome 4				Thematic evaluation - strengthening national capacity for using data to monitor and evaluate national policies and programmes
Organizational effectiveness and efficiency	Institutional evaluation - strategic framework for UNFPA global and regional interventions			Institutional evaluation - results based management
Crosscutting	Synthesis study - learning from UNFPA country programme evaluations 2014-2015 Cluster evaluation		Synthesis study - learning from UNFPA country programme evaluations 2016-2017 Meta evaluation - UNFPA work to address discrimination and to meet the needs of marginalized and vulnerable groups	Cluster evaluation

(*) Global Programme to Enhance Reproductive Health Commodity Security, 2013-2020

30. Under the plan, the Evaluation Office will conduct 12 corporate evaluations, including: five thematic evaluations, two institutional evaluations and five programme evaluations. This includes a number of potential joint evaluations.

31. The Evaluation Office will also complete three thematic evaluations (commissioned in 2014) in the first half of 2016.

32. The Evaluation Office proposes two cluster country programme evaluations. The first, to be conducted in 2016, will pilot the approach. If this approach is found to provide useful learning, a further evaluation will be conducted in 2018.

33. A number of cross-cutting evaluation products are proposed, with an emphasis on synthesis and learning: two synthesis studies of learning from country programme evaluations in 2014-2015 and 2016-2017; and a meta-evaluation of UNFPA work to address discrimination and meet the needs of marginalized and vulnerable groups.

34. All evaluations will be conducted and managed by the Evaluation Office, with the exception of cluster evaluations, which will be undertaken in partnership with UNFPA country offices, and joint or system-wide evaluations, which will be undertaken in collaboration with other agencies.

35. In addition, the Evaluation Office will participate in a number of other studies in partnership with other United Nations agencies.

(a) The Evaluation Office will contribute to up to two inter-agency humanitarian evaluations for level-three crises, subject to available resources.

(b) In 2015, two pilot independent system-wide evaluations commenced. Of these, the Evaluation Office is actively engaged in the evaluation of the contribution of the United Nations development system to strengthening national capacities for data collection and statistical analyses to support the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals and other internationally-agreed development goals.

(c) It is proposed to request a United Nations Evaluation Group peer review of the UNFPA evaluation function in 2017, with reference to the implementation of the revised evaluation policy.

IV. Programme-level evaluations

36. Programme-level evaluations primarily seek to inform the development of the subsequent programme or to contribute to broader lesson learning. They are conducted by external evaluators and managed by the business units responsible for the programme being assessed, as indicated in the paragraph 13(b) of the revised evaluation policy. Both country programmes and thematic programmes of regional relevance were considered in the analysis.

37. All country programmes for which the end of programme cycle falls in 2017-2019 were included in the analysis; with a particular focus on country programmes that have not been previously evaluated or where previous evaluations were unsatisfactory or poor.

38. The Evaluation Office and regional offices considered all selection criteria, in the order of priority established in the revised UNFPA evaluation policy, with feasibility being a key factor in selection of programme-level evaluations. Whether the conditions necessary to achieving good quality evaluations were in place is the responsibility of individual business units. These conditions refer to:

(a) Timeliness, both (i) ensuring that a critical mass of results have already materialized in the field and can contribute to data collection by the evaluators; and (ii) in completing the exercise within a time-frame that allows it to meet the needs of the main users at the most appropriate time;

(b) Evaluability, which depends in particular on (i) the results framework soundness; and (ii) the existence of a results-oriented monitoring system;

(c) The existence of skilled staff to manage the evaluation;

(d) The availability of adequate financial resources.

39. Overall, it is anticipated that 55 country programme-level evaluations will be conducted, across all six UNFPA regions (see table 2).

Table 2. Proposed country programme-level evaluations, 2016-2019

Regions	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Arab States	2	-	1	-	3
Asia and the Pacific	8	-	3	3	14
East and Southern Africa	1	3	2	3	9
Eastern Europe and Central Asia	1	-	1	1	4
Latin America and the Caribbean	4	2	5	-	11
West and Central Africa	6	6	1	2	15
Total country programme-level evaluations per year	**22**	**11**	**13**	**9**	**55**

40. In addition, it is estimated that there will be up to five programme-level evaluations per year. At this stage, it is not possible to reflect these evaluations in the plan, owing to the nature of decentralized programme development; however, they will be reported in the annual evaluation report.

41. Regional offices are working to expand the number and range of evaluations, both programme and thematic, conducted at regional level. Table 3 sets out initial proposals. Future developments will be reported in the annual evaluation report.

Table 3. Proposed regional-level evaluations, 2016-2019

Regions	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Arab States	-	1	-	-	2
Asia and the Pacific	-	-	-	-	-
East and Southern Africa	1	1	-	-	2
Eastern Europe and Central Asia	1	1	1	-	3
Latin America and the Caribbean	1	1	1	-	3
West and Central Africa	1	1	1	-	3
Total per year	**4**	**6**	**2**	**0**	**12**

V. Resources for evaluation

42. An effective evaluation function requires a secure and adequate investment in financial and human resources.

A. Human resources

43. Since 2013, there has been an increase of 28.3 per cent in the number of monitoring and evaluation officers in country offices, with a corresponding decline in the number of focal points. This is a positive trend; it reflects the growing importance placed on results reporting, monitoring and evaluation. Almost half of UNFPA country offices are now staffed with a dedicated monitoring and evaluation officer. On the other hand, staffing levels in the Evaluation Office and regional offices have remained unchanged, despite an increasing workload in light of the revised evaluation policy and in particular the request by the Executive Board to strengthen the decentralized function. It is essential that staffing and structures at both levels respond flexibly as the evaluation function evolves.

44. The Evaluation Office staff is responsible not only for the management of corporate evaluations but also for other activities for which the Office has responsibility. In 2016-2019, the Evaluation Office will continue its support to programme-level evaluations and the business units which manage them. This will be done in the following ways:

(a) Provision of methodological guidance on how to design and conduct programme evaluations at UNFPA;

(b) Training on programme evaluation methodology and coordination of professional development opportunities to develop the evaluation capacity of UNFPA country offices and of national counterparts;

(c) Coordination of evaluation procurement together with regional offices and the Procurement Branch;

(d) Dissemination of evaluation knowledge, through the UNFPA knowledge-management platforms, networks and communities of practice;

(e) Management of the quality assurance system of programme-level evaluations, in coordination with regional offices. A strengthened quality assurance system, covering programme and corporate evaluations, will be introduced in 2016.

45. The transitional budget and workplan for 2014-2015 did not fully reflect the range of roles and responsibilities required of the Evaluation Office to support the strengthening of the evaluation function. Experience implementing the evaluation policy since July 2013 has provided a clearer understanding of the level of human resources required to support the commissioning, management and use of credible evaluations across UNFPA.

46. The Evaluation Office will increase levels of mid-grade staff, and reorganize the responsibilities of existing staff to improve efficiency and strengthen evaluation practice. Use of strategic zero-cost secondments and other low-cost options is being explored, specifically to respond to the short-term need to build capacity at national level. In addition, the Evaluation Office proposes to make more systematic use of short-term contracts to provide specialist research support, as and when required throughout the planned period.

B. Financial resources

47. In line with emerging best practice, the revised UNFPA evaluation policy sets an overall target of 3 per cent of programme expenditure (regular and extra budgetary budget resources) as the recommended minimum level of investment in evaluation (DP/FPA/2013/5 (paragraph 32). In 2014, the budget on evaluation, as a proportion of UNFPA expenditure, was 0.37 per cent, well below the recommended investment. In response to the annual report on evaluation for 2014 (DP/FPA/2015/6) both UNFPA management and the Executive Board stated a commitment to better monitor evaluation expenditure and work to ensure that the level of resources is commensurate with the appropriate level of evaluation coverage and with the necessary alignment with strategic plan, 2014-2017, and its business model.

48. Currently, the majority of UNFPA expenditure on corporate and programme level evaluations is covered by the institutional budget, although most global trust funds and joint programmes and partnerships have specific budgets for evaluation. In view of the recent financing trends, in particular decline in core funding and growing proportion of non-core resources, it is necessary to establish a clear normative framework to guide resource allocation so that programmes funded on non-core resources allocate funds to evaluation as appropriate. This should ensure that funding for evaluation is balanced and sustainable; drawing on diversified funding sources to mirror the broader UNFPA resource mobilization strategy.

49. It is proposed that the resourcing of evaluation is guided by the following key principles:

(a) All evaluations are properly budgeted for at the design or planning phase;

(b) The Evaluation Office has management authority over the evaluation budget contained in the decentralized evaluation plan as a means to quality assure the subsequent evaluation process;

(c) Efforts are made to pool evaluation resources as a more efficient and effective means to evaluate cross-cutting issues of strategic value to UNFPA;

(d) Full transparency on the allocation of resources for evaluation is provided to all key stakeholders through annual reporting to the Executive Board.

50. UNFPA will fund the evaluation function from a blend of resources:

(a) *Institutional budget allocations.* The Evaluation Office receives resources as part of its institutional budget which contributes to funding the implementation of the UNFPA evaluation plan; for corporate evaluations and Evaluation Office staffing and operational costs.

(b) *Regular resources programme allocations.* In the case of evaluations of programmes funded under regular resources, it is proposed that responsible UNFPA business units will contribute up to 3 per cent of the regular programme resource allocation to fund the evaluation, as required. In the case of corporate evaluations, the evaluation budget line will be directly managed by the Evaluation Office. In addition, the Evaluation Office has the authority to pool funding from regular resources, as required, to initiate

corporate evaluations where a cross-cutting, thematic or system-wide evaluation has been identified but where insufficient funds are available from the institutional budget;

(c) *Extrabudgetary resource allocation to specific global, regional and country programme evaluations (including joint programmes)*. Budget requirements for the evaluation of these programmes are stipulated in cooperation / framework agreements established by the UNFPA revised evaluation policy. In the case of corporate evaluations, the evaluation budget line will be directly managed by the Evaluation Office. For decentralised programme evaluations, it is proposed that funding is set at up to 3 per cent of programme budgets. Two-thirds of this allocation is to be used for direct programme evaluation costs. One-third is to provide funding to the Evaluation Office to contribute towards quality assurance, dissemination of lessons learning and synthesis activities;

(d) *Extrabudgetary support from member states and partners*. The Evaluation Office proposes to engage in targeted resource mobilization on a bilateral or multilateral basis for specific evaluations that are not adequately funded via other modalities, and for evaluation capacity-building and national evaluation capacity-building initiatives. Interested Member States and donors will be approached to voluntarily contribute extrabudgetary resources under the management of the Evaluation Office. As part of this strategy, the Evaluation Office will also consider in-kind non-monetary contributions in the form of secondments and short-term expertise.

VI. Expected budget

51. Expected budgets are presented for corporate and programme-level evaluations, together with costs for the evaluation office. These are indicative resources, subject to availability. Budgets will be formalized as part of the formulation of the Integrated Budget.

52. The expected budget is intended to be a general guide rather than a strict budgetary structure. Some flexibility will also be required to meet ad hoc demands that may arise in the course of any given year and for participation in joint evaluations.

53. The overview of costs for corporate evaluations is provided in table 4 below. Further details are included in annex 1.

Table 4. Corporate evaluations – cost overview, 2016-2019

	2016-2017			*2018-2019*		
	Institutional budget	*Other resources*	*Regular resources*	*Institutional budget*	*Other resources*	
Thematic, programme and institutional evaluations						*Total*
Outcome 1		$1,296,000		$669,000	$653,000	$2,618,000
Outcome 2	$275,000				$628,000	$903,000
Outcome 3	$621,000	$451,000		$612,000		$1,684,000
Outcome 4				$587,000		$587,000
Organizational effectiveness and efficiency			$493,000	$485,000		$978,000
Subtotal (thematic, programme and institutional evaluations)	**$896,000**	**$1,747,000**	**$493,000**	**$2,353,000**	**$1,281,000**	**$6,770,000**
Other evaluation studies						*Total*
Synthesis and meta-evaluation	$60,000			$240,000		$300,000
Cluster evaluations	$173,000			$217,000		$390,000
Evaluability assessments		$60,000	$60,000			$120,000
Subtotal (other evaluation studies)	**$233,000**	**$60,000**	**$60,000**	**$457,000**		**$810,000**
Grand total – budget	**$1,129,000**	**$1,807,000**	**$553,000**	**$2,810,000**	**$1,281,000**	**$7,580,000**
Continued from 2014-2015						
Thematic evaluations (adolescents and youth, family planning, and census)	$252,157					

54. Based on recent experience, the Evaluation Office has allocated an average of (a) $450,000 to $550,000 to each major corporate evaluation; (b) $150,000 to $200,000 to more narrowly scoped evaluations; and (c) about $60,000 for evaluability studies and synthesis reports. The main costs are for consultancy fees and travel, based on the assumption that Evaluation Office staff closely scope, prepare and manage evaluations, including dissemination of evaluation results. In general, implementation is carried out by consultant teams, under the management of Evaluation Office staff.

55. The overview of costs for programme-level evaluations is provided in table 5 below. Further details are included in annex 2.

56. The cost of evaluations is borne by the country and regional programmes, and by other operational units.

57. The cost of a programme-level evaluation conducted at decentralized levels reflects the programme complexity, the related volume of activities, as well as the programme overall budget. The Evaluation Office estimates that the budget allocated to a country programme-level evaluation should be no less than $70,000, as there are fixed costs in undertaking an evaluation, driven for instance by the number of consultant days or the number of deliverables (design report, draft and final reports).

58. The budget norm for other types of decentralized programme-level evaluations is up to 3 per cent of the overall programme budget.

Table 5. Programme-level evaluations – overview of costs, 2016-2019

	Estimated budget	
	2016-2017	*2018-2019*
Country programme evaluations by region		
Arab States	$100,000	
Asia and the Pacific	$725,000	$660,000
East and Southern Africa	$400,000	$505,000
Eastern Europe and Central Asia	$70,000	$113,000
Latin America and the Caribbean	$405,000	$320,700
West and Central Africa	$1,029,000	$250,000
Total – country programme evaluations	**$2,729,000**	**$1,878,000**
Regional programme evaluations	$795,000	$180,000
Grand total	**$3,524,000**	**$2,058,000**

59. Table 6 provides an estimate of the overall cost of the evaluation function at UNFPA, including costs for the Evaluation Office. It apportions the amount for the Evaluation Office included in the Institutional Budget indicatively approved by the Executive Board to the period 2016-2017. Amounts for the Evaluation Office in the institutional budget for 2017-2018 are subject to approval by the Executive Board in due course.

60. The budget of the Evaluation Office funds not only the programme or corporate evaluations, but also other activities for which the Office has responsibility. These include its support and oversight role, in particular efforts to strengthen and professionalize the UNFPA evaluation function and underlying systems across the organization; and the participation of the Evaluation Office in partnerships and networks, primarily inter-agency activities aimed at strengthening and harmonizing evaluation within the United Nations system, as well as initiatives to develop national evaluation capacity.

61. It should be noted that the cost of the monitoring and evaluation advisers at regional level, as well as the country level monitoring and evaluation focal points or officers, are excluded from the estimates. UNFPA will explore how best to capture and monitor these expenditures from 2016.

Table 6. Overview of estimated budgeted cost of the evaluation function, 2016-2019

	2016-2017	*2018-2019*	*Total*
Evaluation Office costs (including staff)	$3,994,000	$4,289,000	$8,283,000
Corporate-level evaluations(*)	$3,489,000	$4,091,000	$7,580,000
Programme-level evaluations	$3,524,000	$2,058,000	$5,582,000
Estimated budget of the evaluation function – 2016-2019	**$11,007,000**	**$10,438,000**	**$21,445,000**

(*) Not included here the budget continued from 2014 thematic evaluations (see annex 1)

VII. Risks

62. Risks to the delivery of the evaluation plan include:

(i) *Financial and human resource constraints.* The implementation of the proposed quadrennial budgeted evaluation plan 2016-2019 may be adversely affected if funds are unavailable or curtailed, or if there are unforeseen staff movements. Close attention to financial and human resource planning, would help to mitigate these risks.

(j) *The strategic plan is superseded.* Due to the continuing volatility in the resourcing environment, and with key orientations expected to emerge from the post-2015 discussions, the UNFPA strategic plan, 2014-2017 may need to be revised in the course of its implementation. The rolling approach to evaluation planning would allow relevant adjustments in the evaluation plan to address any major changes in the UNFPA strategic direction.

VIII. Reporting

63. Progress in implementation of the quadrennial budgeted evaluation plan will be reported in the annual report on the evaluation function presented to the Executive Board each year.

The Evaluation Office will incorporate the lessons learned from implementing this plan, including the level of resources in relation to expected results, into the preparation of the next evaluation plan for the consideration by the Executive Board in 2017.